

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

1

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,769	01/15/2002	Daniel L. Klave	SLA1062	9701
50735 MADSON & A	7590 06/21/2007 DSON & AUSTIN		EXAMINER	
15 WEST SOUTH TEMPLE			DAO, THUY CHAN	
SUITE 900 SALT LAKE (CITY, UT 84101		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2192	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/047,769	KLAVE ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Thuy Dao	2192		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address		
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS ansions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 Ap</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.			
Dispositi	ion of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 47-53,55-63,65-72,74 and 75 is/are p 4a) Of the above claim(s) 54,64 and 73 is/are v Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 47-53,55-63,65-72,74 and 75 is/are re Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vithdrawn from consideration.			
Applicati	ion Papers				
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 15 January 2002 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
2)	ct(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

Application/Control Number: 10/047,769

Art Unit: 2192

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on April 3, 2007.

2. Claims 47-53, 55-63, 65-72, and 74-75 have been examined.

Response to Amendments

3. Per Applicants' request, claims 47, 57, and 67 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

4. The Applicants are thanked for a thorough reply. Applicants' arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 47-53, 55-63, 65-72, and 74-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7,212,306 to Chrisop et al. (art made of record, hereinafter "Chrisop") in view of US Patent No. 7,148,980 to Tominaga (art made of record, hereinafter "Tominaga").

Claim 47:

Chrisop discloses a multi-functional peripheral comprising a printer configured to reduce volatile memory usage by selectively loading some individual software components and not loading other individual software components, the multi-functional peripheral comprising:

a processor (e.g., col.1: 12-17);

volatile memory in electronic communication with the processor (e.g., col.1: 17-25),

non-volatile memory in electronic communication with the processor (e.g., col.1: 26-37) comprising:

a plurality of individual software components (e.g., col.1: 12-25); and load each of the plurality of individual software components that are to be loaded, into the volatile memory so that these software components are all loaded into the volatile memory at the same time (e.g., col.1: 26-47).

In an analogous art, Tominaga further discloses:

a loading table that indicates which of the plurality of individual software components are loaded into the volatile memory and which of the plurality of individual software components are not loaded into the volatile memory (e.g., FIG. 26, Administration Table with column License, col.16: 59 – col.17: 18),

wherein the individual software components that are loaded into the volatile memory correspond to a configuration of the multi-function peripheral (e.g., FIG. 26, Printer Type, Printer Name, IP Address, Finishing Option; FIG. 28B, step S2830 "Does Printer Need License? YES/NO", col.18: 50 – col.19: 32), and

wherein the individual software components that are not loaded into the volatile memory do not correspond to the configuration of the multi-functional peripheral (e.g., FIG. 30, B/W MFP 105 – Printer 7 Offline, License Violation, col.18: 25-42);

instructions stored in the non-volatile memory that are executable to:

examine the loading table to determine which of the plurality of individual software components are to be loaded into the volatile memory (e.g., FIG. 29 and 26, col.16: 59 – col.17: 18); and

load each of the plurality of individual software components that are to be loaded, as indicated in the loading table, into the volatile memory so that these software components are all loaded into the volatile memory at the same time (e.g., FIG. 26, FIG. 28B, col.18: 50 – col.19: 32); and

not load any of the plurality of individual software components that are not to be loaded into the volatile memory as indicated in the loading table (e.g., col.18: 25-42).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tominaga's teaching into Chrisop's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to substantiate the validity of use of certain software as suggested by Tominaga (e.g., col.11: 37-64).

Claim 48:

The rejection of claim 47 is incorporated. Chrisop also discloses the multifunctional peripheral is a printer/fax/copier (e.g., col.1: 12-25).

Claim 49:

The rejection of claim 47 is incorporated. Tominaga further discloses an input component in electronic communication with the processor for a user to enter user input and thereby configure the loading table (e.g., col.16: 59 – col.17: 18).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tominaga's teaching into Chrisop's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 47 above.

Claim 50:

The rejection of claim 49 is incorporated. Tominaga further discloses a display in electronic communication with the processor that displays information to the user relating to the loading table (e.g., col.18: 25-42).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tominaga's teaching into Chrisop's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 47 above.

Claim 51:

The rejection of claim 50 is incorporated. Tominaga further discloses a menu structure that may be navigated by a user using the input component and the display to configure the loading table (e.g., col.18: 50 – col.19: 32).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tominaga's teaching into Chrisop's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 47 above.

Claim 52:

The rejection of claim 47 is incorporated. Tominaga further discloses the loading table is a license table comprising a list of licenses relating to the individual software components (e.g., col.16: 59 – col.17: 18).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tominaga's teaching into Chrisop's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 47 above.

Claim 53:

The rejection of claim 52 is incorporated. Chrisop also discloses the individual software components with licenses, as indicated by the license table, are loaded into the volatile memory (e.g., col.18: 25-42).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tominaga's teaching into Chrisop's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 47 above.

Claim 55:

The rejection of claim 47 is incorporated. Chrisop also discloses a communications module in electronic communication with the processor for communications with a computer; and a web interface accessible by a user through use of a web browser to configure the loading table (e.g., col.3: 26 – col.4: 55).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tominaga's teaching into Chrisop's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 47 above.

Claim 56:

The rejection of claim 47 is incorporated. Tominaga further discloses examine a hardware configuration by a loader application; and modify the loading table based on the hardware configuration (e.g., col.4: 31 – col.5: 59).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tominaga's teaching into Chrisop's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so as set forth in claim 47 above.

Claims 57-63 and 65-66:

Claims 57-63 and 65-66 recite the same limitations as those of claims 47-53 and 55-56, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the references teach all of the limitations of the above claims, they also teach all of the limitations of claims 57-63 and 65-66.

Claims 67-72 and 74-75:

Claims 67-72 and 74-75 recite the same limitations as those of claims 47-53 and 55-56, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the references teach all of the limitations of the above claims, they also teach all of the limitations of claims 67-72 and 74-75.

7. Claims 47, 57, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (art made of record, hereinafter "APA") in view of Tominaga.

Claim 47:

APA discloses a multi-functional peripheral comprising a printer configured to reduce volatile memory usage by selectively loading some individual software

Application/Control Number: 10/047,769

Art Unit: 2192

components and not loading other individual software components, the multi-functional peripheral comprising:

a processor (e.g., col.1: 22-25);

volatile memory in electronic communication with the processor (e.g., col.2: 3-12);

non-volatile memory in electronic communication with the processor (e.g., col.2: 3-12) comprising:

a plurality of individual software components (e.g., col.2: 8-15); and load each of the plurality of individual software components that are to be loaded, into the volatile memory so that these software components are all loaded into the volatile memory at the same time (e.g., col.2: 3-15).

In an analogous art, Tominaga further discloses:

a loading table that indicates which of the plurality of individual software components are loaded into the volatile memory and which of the plurality of individual software components are not loaded into the volatile memory (e.g., FIG. 26, Administration Table with column License, col.16: 59 – col.17: 18),

wherein the individual software components that are loaded into the volatile memory correspond to a configuration of the multi-function peripheral (e.g., FIG. 26, Printer Type, Printer Name, IP Address, Finishing Option; FIG. 28B, step S2830 "Does Printer Need License? YES/NO", col.18: 50 – col.19: 32), and

wherein the individual software components that are not loaded into the volatile memory do not correspond to the configuration of the multi-functional peripheral (e.g., FIG. 30, B/W MFP 105 – Printer 7 Offline, License Violation, col.18: 25-42);

instructions stored in the non-volatile memory that are executable to:

examine the loading table to determine which of the plurality of individual software components are to be loaded into the volatile memory (e.g., FIG. 29 and 26, col.16: 59 – col.17: 18); and

load each of the plurality of individual software components that are to be loaded, as indicated in the loading table, into the volatile memory so that these software

components are all loaded into the volatile memory at the same time (e.g., FIG. 26, FIG. 28B, col.18: 50 – col.19: 32); and

not load any of the plurality of individual software components that are not to be loaded into the volatile memory as indicated in the loading table (e.g., col.18: 25-42).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Tominaga's teaching into APA's teaching. One would have been motivated to do so to substantiate the validity of use of certain software as suggested by Tominaga (e.g., col.11: 37-64).

Claim 57:

Claim 57 recites the same limitations as those of claim 47, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the references teach all of the limitations of the above claim, they also teach all of the limitations of claim 57.

Claim 67:

Claim 67 recites the same limitations as those of claim 47, wherein all claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the references teach all of the limitations of the above claim, they also teach all of the limitations of claim 67.

Conclusion

8. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Application/Control Number: 10/047,769

Art Unit: 2192

Page 9

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Thuy Dao (Twee), whose telephone is (571) 272 8570. The examiner can normally be reached on the first Monday of the bi-week, and every Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 6:00AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached at (571) 272 3695.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T. Dao

TUAN DAM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER